

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/518,624 03/03		03/03/2000	Donald B. Peddicord	11162/2001	5802
24349	7590	09/25/2003			
WILLIAM R. GUSTAVSON				EXAMINER	
SUITE 1185 9330 LBJ FF	RWY.		THORNTON, KRISANI		ISANNE MARIE
DALLAS, T	X 75243	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•				1744	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	•	09/518,624		PEDDICORD ET AL.	
a).	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	T	
		Krisanne M. Thorn			
Period fo	Th MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply			ddress	
THE I - Externanter - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period tre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutively received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however ly within the statutory minim will apply and will expire SI. e. cause the application to the	er, may a reply be timely filed um of thirty (30) days will be considered time (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this	ely. communication.	
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·			
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	nis action is non-fina	al.		
3) 🗌 Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under ion of Claims	ance except for fon Ex parte Quayle, 1	nal matters, prosecution as to t 935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	he merits is	
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application	n.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from considerat	ion.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.			•	
7) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirem	ent.		
Applicati	on Papers				
9) 🗌 🧵	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10) 🔲 🗆	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ acce	pted or b)⊡ objected	to by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held	n abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) 🔲 🗆	The proposed drawing correction filed on		-	ner.	
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	•	n.		
12)[1	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 l	J.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been receiv	ed.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been receiv	ed in Application No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17	.2(a)).	Stage	
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	-		Il application)	
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	visional application	has been received.	.FF	
Attachment		-	· ·		
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2	5) 🗌 N	terview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No otice of Informal Patent Application (PT ther:		
S. Patent and Tra PTOL-326 (Re	- · - · ·	tion Summary	Part	of Paper No. 4	

Application/Control Number: 09/518,624

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peddicord et al., U.S. patent No. 6,589,491 or Peddicord U.S. patent No. 6,183,704 in

Application/Control Number: 09/518,624

Art Unit: 1744

view of either of Fentiman U.S. patent No. 2,895,753 or Glickman U.S. patent No. 5,061,219.

Both Peddicord patents teach a salt platform having a support structure configured with a hub and radial braces, some disclosed as curved and which are engaged by frictional fit.

Both Fentiman and Glickman teach joined building structures which are configured with locking elements for cooperative, sustained engagement. Each teach the use of a slot/key type configuration with the slot means being found on the periphery of a hub means and having keyed radial means, with the keys being substantially T-shaped. It is taught that such configurations provided optimized structural stability and connection.

It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the frictional engagement structure of either of the Peddicord systems with the keyed locking elements system of either of Fentiman or Glickman, because the use of such locking systems would provide optimized structural stability and connection.

With respect to claim 10, while the specific angle is not recited within either Fentiman or Glickman, such a configuration is clearly taught and the angle obviously chosen for the given application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne M. Thornton whose telephone number is 703-308-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Wed. 6:30am-4:00pm.

Art Unit: 1744

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Warden can be reached on 703-308-2920. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

KRISANNE THORNTON PRIMARY EXAMINER

September 22, 2003